

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed August 28, 2007 in the above identified patent application.

Claim 9 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Further, new claims 11 and 12 are added. Therefore, claims 1-8 and 10-12 are the claims currently pending the current application.

Claim 1 is amended to clarify features recited thereby. Claim 7 is amended to remove extraneous words; this is not a narrowing amendment. Further, claims 1-8 and 10 are amended to conform them more closely to U.S. patent practice style.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging review and consideration of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on May 9, 2006.

Rejection of Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamamoto et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,627,201. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 requires a window chassis configured to support an outer glass, a glue element for gluing the outer glass to the window chassis, a counterchassis configured and positioned to connect the window chassis to the vehicle body, the counterchassis being glued to the vehicle body and including a draw piece, and a reversible fastener configured and positioned to connect said draw piece to the window chassis.

Without intending to limit the scope of the claims, an effect or advantage of the system for securing an outer glass to the vehicle body according to an aspect of Applicant's invention as claimed in claim 1 is that a more streamlined look or less bulky profile is provided because the outer glass is glued to the window chassis and the draw piece of the counterchassis is glued to the vehicle body. However, the window chassis is detachably attached to the draw piece of the counterchassis so the outer glass together with the window chassis can be easily removed when necessary to change or repair the outer glass. Accordingly, when the glass needs to be replaced, the draw piece need not be removed while the window chassis (which is glued to the outer glass) can be safely removed. Thus, the outer glass can be coplanar to the vehicle body. Accordingly, an outer glass that is coplanar to the vehicle body may be provided, achievable because the outer glass is glued to the window chassis, while at the same time easy replacement of the outer glass

may be provided because the window chassis is separable from the draw piece of the counterchassis glued to the vehicle body.

Hamamoto discloses a window stay for supporting window glass used in vehicles with a window frame and a glass retainer firmly secured to the window frame such that the peripheral edge portion of the window glass is sandwiched fluid-tight between the window frame and the glass retainer (Hamamoto, Abstract). Hamamoto discloses that the securing system includes the outer glass 4 connected to the wall structure 16 of the vehicle body by window frame 10. The window frame 10 is fixed to the vehicle body in a removable manner by a screw 18, and the glass retainer 12 secures the outer glass via reversible clamping flanges 12a and 12b.

Hamamoto does not disclose or suggest a draw piece that is glued to the vehicle body, as required by claim 1. In fact, as discussed, Hamamoto discloses that the window frame is removably attached via screw 18 to the vehicle body.

Further, Hamamoto does not disclose or suggest a glue element for gluing the outer glass to the window chassis, as further required by claim 1. As discussed, Hamamoto discloses that reversible clamping flanges 12a and 12b secure the outer glass 10. Accordingly, Hamamoto does not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 1.

Moreover, Hamamoto does not teach a suggestion or motivation for arriving at the features of claim 1. In fact, as discussed, Hamamoto teaches away from claim 1 because it teaches the use of reversible clamping flanges 12a and 12b and screw 18 to attach the outer glass to the frame structure and to secure the window frame to the vehicle body, respectively. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the features of claim 1 would not have been obvious based on the cited art.

Claims 2-8 and 10 depend from claim 1 and are therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Claim 9 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and therefore the rejection is moot as to this claim.

New Claims 11 and 12

Claims 11 and 12 are added so as more fully to claim patentable aspects of Applicant's invention. Claims 11 and 12 are fully supported by Applicant's disclosure.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 1 and are therefore patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing discussion, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING
SYSTEM ON December 24, 2007.

RCF:GB:mjw:ns



Robert C. Faber
Registration No.: 24,322
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700